ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

VKR Holding A/S v. Daniel fernand Arangi
Case No. D2026-0351

1. The Parties

The Complainant is VKR Holding A/S, Denmark, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Daniel fernand Arangi, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <veluxsecret.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on January 28, 2026. On January 28, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 28, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 29, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on February 2, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy" or "UDRP"), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Supplemental Rules").

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 23, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on February 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Kaya Köklü as the sole panelist in this matter on March 2, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is the parent company of the VELUX Group. Through its subsidiaries, the Complainant inter alia offers roof windows, skylights, vertical windows and systems, thermal solar energy systems, decoration and sun screening products, ventilation, and indoor climate products. Today, the Complainant employs 12,000 people in 37 countries and generates an annual revenue of more than DKK 4 billion.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for the word mark VELUX across various jurisdictions, including the European Union Trademark Registration No. 000955609, registered on March 31, 2000, for VELUX, covering goods in classes 6, 7, 9, and 11.

The Complainant further operates its official website at "www.velux.com".

The Respondent is reportedly located in France.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 9, 2025.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website which displayed the VELUX mark and purportedly offered intimacy pillows.

On November 18, 2025, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist email to the Respondent, to which it received no response.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights; and

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

As per paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the complainant bears the burden of proving that all these requirements are fulfilled, even if a respondent has not substantively replied to the complainant's contentions. *Stanworth Development Limited v. E Net Marketing Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. D2007-1228.

Concerning the uncontested information provided by a complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the provided reasonable factual allegations in a complaint as true. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.3.

It is further noted that the Panel has taken note of the WIPO Overview 3.1 and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views captured therein.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the VELUX trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the VELUX mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the VELUX mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here "secret", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Particularly, the Complainant put forward that the Respondent is neither a business partner of the Complainant nor a licensee of its VELUX trademark. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

There is particularly no evidence in the case file that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. The use of the disputed domain name for purportedly offering intimacy pillows by prominently featuring the Complainant's distinctive VELUX trademark does not give rise to any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent, particularly as the disputed domain name as such reproduces the Complainant's trademark in its entirety and is likely to unduly profit from its value .

Consequently, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's VELUX trademark in its entirety, combined with the term "secret". In the absence of any plausible explanation for such a choice and given the Complainant's online presence and the international reputation of the Complainant's VELUX trademark since many years, including in France, where the Respondent is reportedly located, the Panel finds it unlikely that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name for a purpose independent of the Complainant. The Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain name was more likely than not registered in bad faith.

With respect to the use of the disputed domain name in bad faith, the Panel finds that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name in order to generate traffic to its own website by deliberately taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion that the associated website is either operated or at least authorized by the Complainant. In this regard, the Panel again notes the reputation of the Complainant's VELUX trademark (a coined term), which, on balance, supports the inference of bad faith. In the absence of any counter evidence or explanation suggesting a legitimate non-infringing purpose of use, the Panel concludes that also the purported sale of intimacy pillows under the disputed domain is in bad faith.

Furthermore, the Panel accepts the failure of the Respondent to submit a response to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter as well as its contentions in the present proceeding as an additional indication for bad faith use.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <veluxsecret.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kaya Köklü/
Kaya Köklü
Sole Panelist
Date: March 12, 2026